

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
February 5, 2002
Revised February 19, 2002

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Esposito	Environmental Development (Note – unauthorized alternate)
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Mike Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Pat Flanagan	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon

Public at Large:

Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Constance Clover	McMillin
Dave Shibley	
David Pallinger	Ramona
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
John Norman	South County BIA
Lynne Baker	EHL
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Paul B. Etzel	SDSU/Astronomy
Rich Cantillon	Sierra Club
Ruth Potter	
Sachiko Kohatsu	BOS/Slater
Scott Molloy	J. Whalen Associates

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Gary Pryor (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)
Peggy Gentry (WRT)

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for January 22, 2002
 - Bowlby requested to add the following to his statement, pp. 2 (last bullet on the page): Pauma Valley has a higher density across over two miles for a village center, which is far too much for a valley, and the map, in general, encourages too much estate sprawl, which cannot be justified from a Smart Growth perspective. Also asked how staff interprets “intact landscape principles” as stated in the motion. Scarborough stated that it is conceptual and cannot be thought of in terms of houses, but rather speaks of maintaining the land on a landscape level, so that you would look at an area as a whole.
 - ❖ **Correction made on February 19, 2002:** Bowlby stated that he felt the density was far too much for that particular valley, and not just a valley.
 - Adams moved to approve. Whalen seconded the motion. Minutes approved unanimously.
- b) “Tools” Sub-committee Update
 - Stehly stated that the sub-committee will try to meet every time the official Committee meets. The group is looking at all possibilities for tools, besides TDRs and PDRs.
 - Requested to have a motion placed to hire Rick Pruetz to consult on the topic. Bowlby asked about bringing in other consultants, such as Terry Watt, who was considered by Coombs. Pryor stated that due to the hiring selection process, no particular consultant will be considered in this motion. Stehly moved to have staff hire a consultant. Adams seconded the motion. Motion passed 12 – 1 – 0 (Bowlby opposed).

Agenda Item II: Draft Revisions to the Goals & Policies –

- a) Discussion (all items were based on staff’s draft revisions)
 - **Motion:** Adams stated that he wanted to amend Land Use Goal I to indicate that the Goals & Policies are more than an environmental document. He moved to have it changed to: *Provide sufficient land to meet regional growth demands that is compatible with and sensitive to its natural setting.* Whalen seconded the motion. Gendron was worried about having an overriding issue on an environmental document. Stepner responded that the overriding issue is to provide a place for people to live, which he supports, however does not feel should be placed within this document. Scarborough clarified that Adams was further defining “built environment.” Doyle stated that Adams’s proposal did not belong as a goal but rather a preamble. Added that he did not like the word *provide* due to its connotations that we are a land bank. Adams stated that he was willing to entertain the idea of having his proposal as a preamble. Whalen suggested leaving the goal as is and making Adams’s proposal into a purpose statement. Pryde offered alternative language to the goal: *Plan for a built environment that is compatible with and sensitive to its natural setting.* Adams added: *...that meets growth needs and is compatible....*
 - ❖ **Correction made on February 19, 2002:** Gendron stated that she was concerned that the proposed language would override environmental protection.
 - **Vote:** Motion passed unanimously.
 - Whalen proposed the following changes to the policies under Land Use Goal I:
 - B: replace: *require* with *encourage*
 - D: add to end: *and be consistent with federal regulations.*
 - E: replace: *preserve* with *respects*
 - F: add to beginning: *The Housing Element, existing land use patterns, replace density with development*
 - G: strike-out: *entire policy*
 - H: add and planned: *...towards existing and planned communities.*
 - I: replace: *may be used provided it does not allow increases in planned densities* with *should be encouraged.*
 - J: add should: *Urban growth should be directed to areas within or adjacent to existing...* strike-out: *...and that the rural setting and lifestyle of the remaining areas of the County be retained.*
 - K: replace: *adequate* with *existing or planned*
 - Bowlby proposed the following changes to the policies under Land Use Goal I:

- G: retain the *shall*
- H: retain the *shall*
- Pryde proposed the following changes to the policies under Land Use Goal I:
 - H: add to end: *west of the CWA line.*
- Doyle stated that there are certain policies that should absolutely use such mandatory words as *shall* and that we must set forth a mandatory balance. He suggested adding three additional elements: air quality, redevelopment, and quality of life. He offered the following comments to the policies under Land Use Goal I:
 - D: term *appropriate* undermines the protection of bodies of water
 - F: does not like *constraints* due to its negative connotation
 - G: disagrees with the proposed strike-out
 - H: likes the addition of *west of CWA*
 - Not sure of the *shalls* and *shoulds* on F, G, and H
- Coombs stated that she has a problem with the term *appropriate* in all of the policies. Feels it is a subjective term, it is not descriptive, and it does not give guidance to decision makers. She offered the following to the policies under Land Use Goal I:
 - G: retain the *shall*
 - H: likes the addition of *west of CWA*
 - K: add to end: *to acknowledge that it is or will be available*

b) Action (all items were based on staff's draft revisions)

Motion:	Approved Revision:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land Use Goal I 	<i>Plan for a built environment that meets growth needs and is compatible with and sensitive to its natural setting.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy A: Coombs moved to remove <i>where appropriate</i>. Doyle seconded. Silver suggested changing the policy to <i>Maintain significant viewsheds and ridgelines</i>. Stehly opposed the suggestion because it would require farmers to change crops by removing the <i>where appropriate</i> from the policy. Adams had suggested that this concern be addressed in an agricultural section. ▪ Vote: 14 – 0 – 0 	<i>Maintain significant viewsheds and ridgelines.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy B: Stepner argued that the term <i>encourage</i> did not provide the necessary language to take action on this policy. The term <i>promote</i> was suggested. Stepner moved to have the language read <i>development should be in harmony</i>. Doyle seconded. ▪ Vote: 14 – 0 – 0 	<i>Development should be in harmony with existing topography.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy C: Committee agreed to strike-out this policy. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy D: Bowlby moved to remove <i>as appropriate</i>. Doyle seconded. Silver suggested replacing <i>Protect the integrity of bodies of water</i> with <i>Retain the functions and values of bodies of water</i>. ▪ Vote: 14 – 0 – 0 	<i>Retain the functions and values of bodies of water, including periodic natural wetlands.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy E: Silver moved to approve the replacement of <i>preserve</i> with <i>respects</i>. Adams seconded. ▪ Vote: 14 – 0 – 0 	<i>Utilize design and development techniques which respects the character of the community and protect environmental resources.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policy F: Coombs opposed the language of <i>existing land use patterns</i>. Pryde supported deleting <i>constraints</i>. Adams moved to support the proposal: <i>The Housing Element existing land use</i> 	<i>Development patterns should respect environmental</i>

patterns, and environmental characteristics should determine development patterns. Higgins and Whalen seconded. Whalen was notified that the language *existing land use patterns* would be inconsistent with the concepts, as it goes against clustering. Silver suggested *Development patterns shall take into account environmental characteristics.* Pryde suggested striking the policy. Adams amended his motion to *Development patterns should respect environmental characteristics.*

- **Vote:** 12 – 2 – 0 (Bowlby and Lambron opposed)

-
- **Policy G:** Doyle moved to remove this policy from the Land Use section and to move it into the Public Facilities section. Whalen seconded. Suggested language of *Public facilities and utilities should be compatible with the County's land use pattern* is to be discussed when added to the Public Facilities section. Coombs felt it should not be removed until it was placed within Public Facilities.

- **Vote:** 13 – 0 – 1 (Coombs abstained)

-
- **Policy H:** Bowlby moved to approve the retention of *shall* and the addition of *west of the CWA line.* Gendron seconded. Adams stated that he could not support the language because the CWA line is not a demarcation line and there are planned communities that are approved. Stepner suggested adding *and adopted and approved planned communities.* Whalen stated that he would prefer to retain the original proposal or delete the policy. He did not like Stepner's suggestion because there are communities that are approved but not adopted. Higgins moved to rescind the motion. Bowlby modified his motion to retain *west of the CWA line.* Pryor stated that the map already does this and there needs to be caution with the CWA line because each community has room for growth. Phil seconded the motion due to Gendron's absence.

- **Vote:** 4 – 9 – 1 (proxy vote given to Pryde)
- Adams moved to strike-out the policy.
- **Vote:** 8 – 5 – 0

Agenda Item III: Process –

- **Motion:** Pryde moved to have items that are to be discussed in great detail to be distributed prior to the meeting. Motion passed unanimously.
- We are still anticipating review of a digitized map at our next meeting, February 19th.

Agenda Item IV: Public Comments –

- Paul Etzel: Re-affirming whether policy C under Conservation was stricken due to an already established policy. Carmichael affirmed this and stated it needs to be re-worded. Etzel argued that dark skies should be an established policy as an outdoor lighting policy and by removing the line, he questioned what would keep the Board from removing the ordinance.
- Larry Glavinic: Supports the notion of implementing tools and has a presentation he would like to present to the sub-committee.
- Dave Shibley: Stated that the committee is making assumptions in the first couple of policies, as a valley can be seen as a viewshed. Questioned whether it meant one could not grade by leaving out the word *encourage* in policy B.
- Dutch Van Dierendonck: Stated that we should start using the term *Smart Type Growth* and consider *smart* to be an acronym for *Save Money and Reduce Traffic.*